

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

In the Office Action dated December 8, 2003, the Examiner requested that Figs. 1-3 be designated by a legend such as "prior art". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit herewith revised Figs. 1-3 which include the requested legend.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner stated the "in regard to claims 1 and 11, the specification failed to disclose an apparatus or method where the epipolar line is determined by connecting correspondence points of line of sight connecting virtual position and the object to be imaged. (Refer to Fig. 1). The specifications and the drawings detail an epipolar line is determined by connecting correspondence points of line of sight between the reference camera and the detection camera."

In response, Applicants first of all note that independent claims 1 and 11 of the present application have been amended so as to clarify that the epipolar line is "an epipolar line on the image picked-up by the image picked-up means determined by connecting correspondence points of . . ."

Applicants respectfully wish to point out that the epipolar line as claimed in independent claims 1 and 11 is that as taken by a *detection camera*, not a virtual camera. Please refer to the reference camera as shown, for example, in Figs. 1 and 6-8. It appears, however, the Examiner has based his § 112 rejection on a virtual camera arrangement (as evidenced by the Examiners own schematic in the Office Action), which substantially corresponds with the virtual camera 3c in Fig. 11 of the present application. Such correspondence is simply incorrect with respect to the limitations found in amended independent claims 1 and 11.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed subject matter of, in particular, independent claims 1 and 11 of the present application as amended, is in fact, described in the specification in such a way so as to comply with the enablement requirement.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 112 rejection be withdrawn at this time, and that a substantive review of the present-pending claims be made at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

William E. Vaughan

Reg. No. 56,056

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4292

Dated: March 8, 2004